

OLD AND NEW

ON THE ATTIC PHRATRY OF THE THERRIKLEIDAI

AMONG the recently published inscriptions from the Athenian Agora is a document dealing with phratries, Agora inv. no. I 7500.¹ The wretched condition of this inscription precludes speculation as to its nature and purpose, but a close examination of the fragmentary phrases preserved on the stone reveals a number of interesting, if disjointed, facts.

The stone is of Pentelic marble. It was found in the southeast corner of the Agora Excavations “under the third step leading up to the gate of Athena, at Agora grid square V 13.”² The editor, M. Walbank, dates the inscription by its letter forms to the first half of the 3rd century B.C.³

TEXT

NON-ΣΤΟΙΧ.

	AK[----- γεγο]-	
	νότων ἐκ τῶν ι[-----]	
	τῶν ὄρκων μεχρὶ [-----]	
	αι ἀ[λ]λήλοις καίτοι .[-----]	
5	ναι ἔάν τι ἄλλο ψηφίζων[ται ----- ἐλέσθαι]	
	δὲ καὶ ἐπιμελητὰς δυὸ μέ[ν -----]	
	κατα[δ]έηται τῶμ φρατριά[ρχων -----]	
	τας διδόναι τῆμ ψηφον [----- τὰ ἱερε]-	
10	ώσυνα λαμβάνειν τ[----- τοῖς Θερρικ]-	
	λείδαις ἐπιτιμ[-----]	
	ἐν τῇ κυρία[ι -----]	
	φρατρία[-----]	

Line 1: Walbank reads ΑΚΑ[. .]ΔΕΙ[- -]. Having re-examined the stone in the Agora, I can find no trace of Α or of the ΔΕΙ

Lines 1-2: [γεγο]|νότων Walbank

Line 4: Walbank reads the last preserved letter of this line as Α. The trace on the stone seems to me to be incompatible with this letter. More likely here is the letter Χ

Line 5: [ἐλέσθαι] Walbank

Line 6: In Walbank's text: μέν - - -] is a misprint for μέ[ν - - -]

Line 7: Walbank reads the last letter of this line as Ω, restoring φρατριῶ[ν]. The letter is most certainly Α, and the restoration is accordingly changed to φρατριά[ρχων].

Lines 8-9: [τὰ ἱερε]|ώσυνα Walbank

Line 9: τ[ὸν ἱερέα?] Walbank

Lines 9-10: [τοῖς Θερρικ]|λείδαις Hedrick

¹ M. Walbank, “Greek Inscriptions from the Athenian Agora, Fifth to Third Centuries B.C.,” *Hesperia* 51, 1982, pp. 48-50, no. 7, with photograph, pl. 20.

² *Ibid.*, p. 48.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 49.

Line 12: φρατρια[ρχ --] Walbank

Line 13: Walbank reads [. . .]N[--] in this line. I cannot perceive this letter.

It is clear from lines 7 and 12 that this inscription is concerned with a phratry. The reference to the administration of the vote (line 8) and to the *ἱερεώσυνα* (line 9) suggest, as Walbank notes, that we are dealing with phratry regulations.⁴

Line 6: ἐπιμελητὰς. This is our only evidence for the office of epimelete in an Attic phratry. Outside Attica, to the best of my knowledge, the office is only once attested for a phratry, in a document of the Klytidai of Chios.⁵ Even the verb ἐπιμελέω does not occur to describe the functions of the officials in an Attic phratry, save in one inscription where it has been tentatively restored.⁶ Given the paucity of the evidence, it is impossible to determine the function of the epimeletes in the present context.

Lines 7–8: κατα[δ]έηται τῶμ φρατριά[ρχων --] | τας διδόναι τῆμ ψῆφον.

Since φρατρια[–] must be a genitive plural, the only possible restoration is φρατρι-ά[ρχων]. The following line contains a reference to “administering the vote.” This action should be undertaken by the presiding officer of the body, that is, the phratriarch.⁷ As it is clear from the preceding line that more than one phratriarch is involved in these proceedings, it is reasonable to suppose that the subject of the infinitive will be an accusative plural. This assumption is born out by the letters -τας at the beginning of line 8, which should be interpreted as the end of a participle modifying [φρατριάρχους]. The sense of this phrase may be rendered as follows: “if someone entertains the phratriarchs, they (i.e. the phratriarchs) shall administer the vote.”

The only attestation of a phratry with two phratriarchs is found in *IG II*², 1241, lines 5–9, a document of the phratry of the Dyaleis. It has normally been held that this twin chief magistracy implies that the phratry has a dual character; the Dyaleis are thus taken to be two distinct groups merged into one phratry.⁸ It now appears from the present inscription that the Therrikleidai also had more than one chief magistrate. In light of this new evidence, the standard interpretation of *IG II*², 1241 will have to be reviewed.

Line 9: λαμβάνειν τ[– –]. Walbank, comparing *IG II*², 1237, lines 4–5, restores τ[ὸν ἱερέα?] here.⁹ In substance this is correct: the *ἱερεώσυνα* should be taken by the priest of the phratry. Since more than one phratriarch, however, is involved in the proceedings of this

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 49. Walbank is right to draw attention to the verbal parallels between this document and *IG II*², 1237, but he goes too far in supposing that the present document is also concerned with “regulations for the admission of new phratry members.”

⁵ *SIG*³, 987. In lines 36–41 it is ordered that τοὺς δ’[ἐ]πιμελητὰς τὰς γενομένας γνώμας [π|ερί] τοῦ οἴκου καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν καὶ τὰ[s|δι]αμαντείας ἀναγράφαντας εἰς σ[τ|ήλ]ην λιθίνην στήσαι παρὰ τὴν εἴσο[δο]ν τοῦ οἴκου. In Attic phratries the duty of publication of an inscription normally fell to the phratriarch. Cf. *IG II*², 1239, lines 24–26; 1240, lines 10–11 (restored); 1241, lines 55–56. In the case of the Demotionidai, this duty apparently fell to the priest when the document was to be erected in a sacred area (*IG II*², 1237, lines 66 and 123–125) and to the phratriarch when in a profane area (*IG II*², 1237, lines 121–123).

⁶ *IG II*², 1242, line 4: συν[επιμελήσονται].

⁷ See K. Latte, *RE s.v.* “Phratriarchos”. For an example of the phratriarch “administering the vote” (the only instance from Attica), see *IG II*², 1237, lines 79–81.

⁸ On this point, cf. U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Aristoteles und Athen*, Berlin 1893, II, pp. 267–268; M. Guarducci, “L’istituzione della fratria nella Grecia antica e nelle colonei greche d’Italia. Parte prima,” *MAL*, ser. 6, 7, 1937, p. 51.

⁹ *Op. cit.* (footnote 1 above), p. 50.

document, we cannot be sure that the plural *τοὺς ἱερέας* is not to be restored here. As we have just seen, more than one phratriarch is involved in “administering the vote.”

Lines 9–10: [τοῖς Θερρικ] | λείδαις. The ending *-λείδαι* is clearly patronymic. In the context of this inscription it must be the name of a phratry. Only one Attic phratry is attested whose name ends in *-λείδαι*: the *Θερρικλεῖδαι*.¹⁰

The Therrikleidai are attested from two inscriptions. The first is a boundary stone of the sanctuary of Apollo Patroios of the Therrikleidai.¹¹ The provenience of this inscription is not recorded, nor is the location of the sanctuary known from other evidence. The second is a stele which mentions the *θεσμός* of the hero shrine of *Θερρικλῆς*, the *Θερρικλείου*.¹² Fragments of this stele were found scattered throughout the southeast corner of the Agora. Now, I 7500 was also found in this vicinity, at Agora grid square V 13. It is worth noting that one of the fragments of the stele, number 8, came from precisely this area. It was found in the wall of a modern house at No. 5 Polygnotos Street.¹³ The topographical coincidence of the findspot of the present inscription with that of the fragments of the stele suggests that the Therrikleidai had some connection with this part of the Agora. The connection is most easily explained in terms of the site of the Therrikleion, which must be located somewhere in this area.

A remaining problem is the division of the name *Θερρικ* | *λεῖδαι* between lines 9 and 10. This inscription seems to divide words syllabically at the ends of lines.¹⁴ The only possible exception is at the beginning of line 4: *-αι*. This seems to be the end of an infinitive, and may (or may not) contravene the rules of syllabification.

This anomalous division of *Θερρικ* | *λείδαι* is the only argument against the restoration: it is not sufficient to outweigh the historical-topographical evidence. The rules of syllabification are not always strictly observed. An inscription may generally follow syllabic division and yet present many exceptions.¹⁵ In fact, the late 4th and early 3rd centuries in Attica are a transitional period, as arrangement of epigraphical texts changes from stoichedon to syllabic division.¹⁶ The tendency toward syllabic division has not reached full force, and observation of the rules is often inconsistent.

¹⁰ For a convenient list of phratries, see K. Latte, *RE s.v.* “Phratric”, col. 755. To his references for Attic phratries, add the following: Gleontis: *Hesperia* 17, 1948, p. 35, no. 18. Medontidai: *Hesperia* 10, 1941, pp. 15–17, no. 1, lines 17–18; *IG* I², 871, 872; II², 1233. Therrikleidai: *IG* I³, 243, line 30. Thymaitis: J. V. A. Fine, *Hesperia*, Suppl. IX, *Horoï*, Princeton 1951, p. 11, no. 21. Thyrgonidai: Photios, *s.v.* *Τιταγίδαι*. Titagidai: Photios *s.v.*

¹¹ *IG* II², 4973: [ἰ]ερό[ν] | Ἀπόλ[λωνο]ς | Πατρ[ώιου] φρ[ο] | [ατρία]ς Θερρικ[] | [λείδ]ων. The present inscription does not help to locate the site of this *ἱερόν*.

¹² *IG* I³, 243 = B. D. Meritt, “Greek Inscriptions,” *Hesperia* 36, 1967, pp. 72–84, no. 15, face B, lines 30–31: *θεσ[μός] ἀπὸ τῶν πρόσθεν τῶ* | *Θερ[ικ]λεῖο [᾿Α] | τθ[ί]δον στελῶν*. Meritt dates this text to about 480, *op. cit.*, pp. 83–84. For the forms *Θερρικλεῖδαι* > *Θερρικλεῖδαι* > *Θερρικλεῖδαι*, see L. Threatte, *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions*, I, *Phonology*, Berlin and New York 1980, pp. 511, 513–514 and 534–535; Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *op. cit.* (footnote 8 above), p. 268, note 9, and Meritt, *op. cit.*, p. 73.

¹³ Meritt, *op. cit.*, p. 79.

¹⁴ Threatte, *op. cit.* (footnote 12 above), p. 66: “A combination of a stop and a liquid or a nasal . . . is almost never divided; normally both consonants go on the second line. . . . Exceptions are very rare.”

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 69: “The examples cited . . . have been taken from texts dating ca. 300 B.C.–ca. 300 A.D. in which the laws of syllabification are generally observed. During this period there are also texts which avoid the rules altogether, or contain numerous infractions of them.”

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 63–64.

Line 10: ἐπιτιμ[---]. Walbank takes this to be a part of the verb ἐπιτιμάω.¹⁷ This is possible, but there is no reason why this might not just as well be divided to form the preposition ἐπὶ and τιμ[---]. For example, this might be part of the dating formula: ἐπὶ τοῦ δεῖνος ἄρχοντος or φρατριαρχοῦντος.¹⁸

Line 12: φρατρια[---]. Walbank restores φρατρια[ρχ- - -].¹⁹ It is impossible to determine, however, whether this is a reference to phratriarch or phratries.

The present inscription provides notable additions to our knowledge of the Attic phratry. It gives the first attestation of the office of epimelete in an Attic phratry and supplies the first parallel to the dual phratriarchs attested in the phratry of the Dyaleis, *IG II²*, 1241. The document further constitutes an addition to our growing dossier on the phratry of the Therrikleidai and helps to locate with more certainty and precision the site of the hero shrine of Therrikles in the Athenian Agora.²⁰

C. W. HEDRICK, JR.

THE AMERICAN SCHOOL OF CLASSICAL STUDIES AT ATHENS

¹⁷ *Op. cit.* (footnote 1 above), p. 50.

¹⁸ Cf. *IG II²*, 1237, lines 9–12.

¹⁹ *Loc. cit.*

²⁰ I take this opportunity to thank friends and teachers in the United States and Athens for their criticisms and the Fulbright foundation for their generous financial support.